

RVB Revisited

Philip W. Anderson

*Joseph Henry Laboratories of Physics
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544*

We propose that early speculations on the nature of the normal state of the CuO_2 planes in high T_c superconductors can be revised and brought into agreement with more modern theories, simulations and experimental observations. The early speculations proposed an “RVB” state which is an incompressible liquid of singlet pairs in which the magnetic excitations are spin 1/2 fermion-like objects called spinons, the charge exhibiting a separate dynamics (charge-spin separation.) The revisions proposed are the following: (1) At finite concentrations x of holes there are two non-Fermi liquid, charge-spin separated states, (I) a metal with a full Fermi surface (the “Luttinger Liquid”) and no spin gap, and below a crossover (II) a spin-gapped RVB state of “d” symmetry with spinons at gap nodes (“nodons”).

(2) Since spinons have no phase—no charge—the gap parameter in the second phase must be real, $d_{x^2-y^2}$, as proposed by Affleck and Kotliar.

(3) Both are based on a large Fermi surface satisfying Luttinger’s theorem.

(4) Phase I is a good metal in the ab direction, phase II is a poor metal. There appear to be two types of transition into the superconducting state, depending on whether it takes place from phase I or II. Whether there are two mechanisms causing superconductivity remains unclear as also is the relationship between the two.

In the first months after the discovery of high T_c superconductivity the close connection of this phenomenon with the one-band Hubbard model in two dimensions was realized [1,2]. An old speculation called “resonating valence bonds”, about a possible non-symmetry-breaking solution of the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model in two dimensions (to which the Hubbard model reduces at half filling), was revived [1], and used to motivate a scenario for explaining the high T_c phenomenon.

Zou and Baskaran, along with others [3], showed that the RVB state naturally led to the idea of charge-spin separation and to the concept of the “spinon”, a spin 1/2 object which can be thought of as half of a spin wave or half of an electron (the idea of Fermionic spin 1/2 excitations of an antiferromagnet dates back in fact to Landau.) The one-dimensional Hubbard model has non-classical soliton-like excitations carrying a spin of 1/2, and it was thought that they could appear in 2D also. The “RVB” state is a ground (“vacuum”) state made up of singlet pairs of electrons, and the spinon soliton is thought of as a single spin moving freely through the background gas of singlets, displacing the singlet correlations but not the charge. In one D it can also be thought of as a π phase singularity in a spin density wave. The RVB state is an incompressible spin liquid, in the sense that the one-electron compressibility (the density of states) vanishes, $\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial k}$ and $\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \omega}$ both diverge, and v_F and hence the true compressibility remains finite but $Z \equiv 0$.

The most accurate characterization of the spinon has come from studies of exactly soluble one-dimensional models, the Lieb-Wu solution of the Hubbard model and the Haldane-Shastry solution of the $1/r^2$ model, as well as from tomographic bosonization of the 2D interacting electron gas. The spinon can be defined in terms of non-Abelian bosonization of the spin fluctuations of a Fermi sea at any interaction and for any density, and is necessarily a semion in Haldane’s sense rather than an anyon or a true Fermion. For any case where renormalized perturbation theory (Fermi Liquid Theory) remains valid, its velocity is degenerate with that of the charge fluctuations and it is merely half of a quasiparticle. It is also useful to think of it as moving on a “squeezed” Heisenberg model from which the holes have been removed; at the Fermi surface particles move non-diffractively and the spin degrees of freedom are like those in the 1D model because removing holes does not alter the spin ordering.

While the spinon, at least in 2D, is rigorous only as a Fermi surface excitation, visualization in terms of the RVB type of state as a Gutzwiller-projected electron, as in Ref. 2, is a useful guide to our thinking. Of course, a similar caveat about the Fermi surface exists for the quasi-particle concept, for that matter.

It soon became clear that the RVB idea in its original form was not sophisticated enough to account for high T_c . While other authors, most notably Lee and co-workers [4], continued with modified versions of the original scheme, a number of authors beginning with R.B. Laughlin [5] and including Wilczek [6] and others have emphasized the “flux phase” version of RVB and its relation to anyon theory, while I have retained the idea of spinons and spin-charge separation, but focussed on the non-Fermi Liquid metallic state [7], and on the effect of spin-charge separation in modifying transport processes, and neglected the “pairing” aspect of the theory. In fact, I postulated that the single 2D plane was not superconducting by itself [7].

It was in connection with RVB theory that the idea of a d-wave order parameter first arose, in work of Affleck and of Kotliar, [8] since in a simple square lattice Heisenberg model “d wave” is a natural solution of the mean field equations using nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic exchange

$$\sum_{\langle ij \rangle = nn} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j \quad (1)$$

as a 4-spinon interaction, where

$$\vec{S}_i = \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} s_{\sigma}^+ \vec{S}_{\sigma\sigma'} s_{\sigma'}. \quad (2)$$

The s ’s are spinon operators, which we shall define later.

The basic derivation of (1) was put forward by Rice, adapted from my own derivation of “superexchange” in Mott insulators. A modern version to which we will later refer was

given by Zou. In the presence of a strong repulsive interaction “ U ”, the amplitude of doubly occupied states is renormalized to zero by a projective canonical transformation which is perturbative in t/U , where t is the hopping kinetic energy. This projective transformation cannot be continued smoothly to a perturbation theory in positive powers of the interaction U because it is projective. Thus when an antiferromagnetic “ J ” is postulated, Fermi liquid theory has per se been abandoned. The signal for this is that the kinetic energy term “ T ” in the $t - J$ Hamiltonian is projected onto a subspace with zero double occupancy, so that the fluctuations are algebraically distinct from conventional quasiparticles.

We observe that the spin fluctuations can be expressed in terms of spinons, and that the exchange interaction affects only the spinons directly, since the two sites “ i ” and “ j ” must both be occupied in order for the superexchange effect to act. In most theories of the cuprates, conventional exchange (which is always ferromagnetic) is neglected. Thus we follow custom in assuming that the true interaction is $S_i \cdot S_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4}$ and no interaction affects parallel spins, in our first crude survey of the problem.

The original RVB hypothesis was that a good variational ground state of (1) could be attained by the Ansatz

$$\psi_0 = P_G^A \psi_{MF} \quad (3)$$

where P_G^A is the $n = 1$ projector

$$P_G^A = \prod_i (n_{i\uparrow} + n_{i\downarrow} - 2n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}) \quad (4)$$

and ψ_{MF} is a mean field BCS or Hartree-Fock solution of the problem of N electrons on N sites. My original hypothesis was a BCS solution with a symmetrical energy gap going to zero at a Fermi surface, with kinetic energy,

$$\Delta_k = \gamma_k = J(\cos k_x + \cos k_y) \quad (5)$$

which is called an “extended s ” solution, and is equivalent, as I showed (following Rice) to a half-filled tight-binding band of noninteracting electrons, projected on $n_i = 1$.

Affleck soon pointed out that an equivalent solution was the ‘ d -wave’ with

$$\Delta_k^d = J(\cos k_x - \cos k_y) \quad (6)$$

and shortly thereafter Kotliar, as well as Zhang et al, suggested “ $s + id$ ” where

$$\Delta_k = \gamma_k + i\Delta_k^d \quad (7)$$

which is variationally better and has nodes of the one-spinon energy rather than a Fermi surface. This in turn was equivalent, essentially, to another choice, the so-called “flux phase”, in which the Hartree-Fock solution is for electrons with kinetic energy $\epsilon_k = \gamma_k$ and a flux of $\Phi_{0/2} = “\pi”$ natural units through each plaquette of the lattice.

All of these “RVB” solutions of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian (1) could be variationally improved and their energies compared, but all turned out to be slightly inferior to the Néel state with antiferromagnetic long range order, which also turned out to be the actual physical state of the cuprate CuO_2 planes when doped to Cu^{++} , where (1) is an appropriate Hamiltonian. Hsu showed that one could consider the Néel

state as a somewhat weak symmetry-breaking perturbation of the flux phase, and understand its experimental high-energy spectrum in terms of flux phase spinons, but otherwise the “flux phase” has receded somewhat into the background as a result of the fact that it seems not to be easily generalized to the doped 2D case with mobile holes, which is thought to be a good model for the superconducting cuprates. The most straightforward such attempt is to change the flux from π , giving a state which is not time-reversal invariant, contrary to all experimental tests.

As a result of this failure, the flux phase solution has tended to be ignored, even though it has the nodal structure which is so conspicuous in the observations, and which shows up fairly clearly in numerical calculations on the 2D Hubbard model [9] A purpose of the present paper is to suggest that the correct generalization of the “ $s + id$ ” or flux phase does not involve time-reversal and that the apparent dependence upon the introduction of “ i ” or a π flux is illusory. This was indicated very early by constructing actual real space wave functions for the flux phase, which turned out to be entirely real.

In the early work spinons were treated as full-fledged Fermions. In order to satisfy the projective constraints it was necessary to introduce an $SU(2)$ gauge field. With fuller understanding of the process of non-Abelian bosonization from which they arise, and of exact one-dimensional models where they are elementary excitations, it can be demonstrated that spinons can be described as semions, and that their algebraic character and statistics do not change all the way from the noninteracting electron case to the Mott insulator. The spinon propagator remains asymptotically $(x - v_s t)^{-1/2}$, and spinon amplitudes are $SO(2)$ matrices with real determinant. Thus in a Hartree-Fock factorization of the exchange term (1) it is not consistent to allow complex self-energies for spinons to arise. The self-energy can contain an anomalous (pairing) term, but this term cannot be complex: the self-energy is a real, orthogonal matrix, not a Hermitian one.

$$\sum_{\sim} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \sum \\ \Delta \\ \sum \end{array} \right) \quad (7)$$

where Δ like $\sum$, is real. [Another way of seeing this is that the two possible zero-momentum, zero-spin pairings of spinons are $\langle s_{k\sigma}^+ s_{k\sigma} \rangle$ and $\langle s_{k\sigma}^+ s_{-k-\sigma}^+ \rangle$, but $s_{k\sigma}$ and $s_{-k-\sigma}^+$ are equivalent under a $U(1)$ gauge group of Abelian rotations, which allows only one extra degree of freedom.]

Thus the spinons can have a conventional self-energy (γ_k) and a single real anomalous one Δ_k^d , but not a third, since no such degree of freedom exists. The existence of an anomalous self-energy generated from the exchange term does not, therefore, in any sense imply superconductivity, since a spinon gap has no phase.

We can, thus, envisage two types of RVB, non-superconducting states: one in which the spinons form a Fermi surface, with $\Delta = 0$; and one in which the spinons would have nodal points with Dirac-like excitations about the nodes. The latter would form below some critical temperature of the order of J given by a BCS-like equation. Neither is stable at low T because the umklapp terms force a magnetic order on the half-filled case; but they do have a definable or-

der parameter in the sense that the Fermi surface, or Dirac points, are an order parameter [10].

Now let us move away from the half-filled case and dope the system. Let us assume that spin-charge separation remains valid—for example, we can use the Zou transformation, suitably modified to work with spinon semions and not Fermions, and from it derive a superexchange interaction via the $t - J$ transformation. It is important to realize that the exchange interaction involves only spinons, so that any energy derived from it still does not directly effect superconductivity; it causes an energy gap, for spin excitations, which is intrinsically real. (For a practical illustration of this possibility, see the analysis in my interlayer theory of the spin gap, which is applicable in modified form here.) [11]

We shall make an arbitrary but reasonable (and I suspect provable) assumption about charge-spin separation using spinons. This is that as the system is doped away from half-filling, the Fermi surface for spinons as defined by the self-energy $\sum_k$ continues to enclose a number of momentum states equal to twice the number of particles. There are several ways to justify this. First, the number of spin degrees of freedom = the number of spinons = twice the number of particles, and independent spinons comprise the interior of the Fermi surface only. Second, when eventually the charge attaches itself to the spinons and makes quasiparticle degrees of freedom, it will be the spinons, with their fixed statistics, which determine the Fermi surface; charge degrees of freedom in the Luttinger liquid as in anyon theory or the dual theories of Fisher et al have no fixed statistics.

In the Zou derivation of the $t - J$ Hamiltonian, or in fact in any reasonable treatment of the kinetic energy term

$$T = P_G \sum_{k,\sigma} \epsilon_k n_{k\sigma} P_G$$

the $n_{k\sigma}$ may be factorized into a product of bilinear operators in charge and spin variables; in Zou and Baskaran's approach as quoted in (1), (after projecting out double occupancy):

$$\mathcal{H} = t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} e_i^+ e_j s_{i\sigma}^+ s_{j\sigma} + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (s_{i\uparrow}^+ s_{j\downarrow} - s_{i\downarrow}^+ s_{j\uparrow}) \times (cc) \quad (10)$$

As we learn in the tomographic bosonization approach, e , the “holon” operator, is not an elementary excitation with any conventional statistics, in the same way that $s_{i\sigma}$ is, and its dynamics need to be further analyzed. Nonetheless $t < e_i^+ e_j >$ must be proportional to the mean kinetic energy of hole motion, proportional roughly to x , the number of holes. This will provide an addition to the diagonal self-energy which at half-filling is solely due to exchange.

The charge-correlation sum rule controlling the magnitude of the “Drude” peak is empirically, in the cuprates, and theoretically, in 1D, roughly linearly proportional to x ; we believe the same is to be expected for this term in the spinon kinetic energy. Thus the spinon's velocity, i.e., the inverse of the density of states, given by the diagonalized self-energy, will grow proportionally to $J + \text{const} \times tx$, while J itself will become smaller as x increases, because the fraction of nearest neighbor sites which are both occupied decreases as $(1 - x)^2$.

We can schematize these conclusions in a phase diagram of temperature vs doping percentage x (Fig 1). [12] The lines

are not true phase boundaries but crossovers, since because of local gauge degrees of freedom actual broken symmetry can only occur at absolute zero. We place the hypothesized transition for $x = 0$ at $\sim J$, leaving out of account the ordered antiferromagnetic state, and recognize that here the “extended s ” and “ d -wave” gaps will appear together. But as the spinon velocity rises proportionally to x , we will have an increasing regime where the spinon Fermi surface is established while at a lower temperature will appear the d -wave gap Δ_k^d . This lower temperature scale will be

$$T^* = J_{eff}(x) e^{-\frac{t_{eff}(x)}{J_{eff}(x)}} \quad (11)$$

where $J_{eff}(x)$ will decrease as $(1 - x)^2$ and $t_{eff}(x)$ will increase with x . This is presumably the energy scale “ T^* ” seen in ARPES and other measurements in the underdoped regime. The resulting smearing and gapping of the Fermi surface is observed in the computations of Puttিকা et al [9] using series extrapolations.

Thus we have a basic phase diagram for the two-dimensional Hubbard model which is divided into two regions, both of which are charge-separated non-Fermi liquids. (For the two-dimensional case, I have shown that the true Fermi liquid without separate spinons occurs only for zero coupling or density.) In the cuprates, as charge-spin separation becomes weaker we will begin to get coherent interlayer coupling and a true Fermi liquid will set in somewhere in the overdoped region.

In the Fig (1) phase diagram, the NFL (Luttinger liquid) regime extends over an increasingly wide region as x increases.

Fig (1) is the phase diagram of the isolated plane. What I do not presume to speculate on is whether or not this actually contains a region of true superconductivity. The arguments of Lee Nagaosa and Wen at least make it plausible that this may be the case. If so, the region where superconductivity may appear is the crosshatched area of Fig. (1). As observed both by Nagaosa and Lee, and by the “nodon” arguments of Nayak et al, T_c for the superconductors is very seriously limited by the low stiffness (high mass) which is implied for gap fluctuations in the small- x regime, by straightforward sum rule arguments. Nonetheless, it appears that superconductivity may be possible in the isolated CuO_2 plane, without interlayer enhancement; several compounds seem to support this possibility experimentally—highly doped BISCO “2201”, and Tl 2201; in particular. (Not $NdCCO$, which is apparently an s -wave superconductor.)

Optimally doped compounds, however, seem in general to develop directly from the NFL region without an intervening d -wave RVB phase (i.e., an intervening pseudogap). However, invariably—for the truly high T_c cases—the superconductivity occurs in the d -wave state favored by RVB arguments. Also, in the superconducting state, as opposed to the spin gap state, the nodes experimentally are mathematically sharp, in contradiction to the expectations of theories relying exclusively on interlayer tunneling as expressed, for instance, in Ref. (7). This fact seems to require that some component of the attractive interaction have d -wave symmetry, i.e, that it be of long range in k -space. Our working concept that the intralayer interaction only involves spinons would be sufficient, if at the optimum this intralayer interaction is above or near

its natural T_c^* . But as yet it seems not clear what the admixture of interactions responsible for the higher T_c may be.

It is, however, possible to make the following statement: attractive interactions between opposite-spin electrons such as are necessary to cause a singlet superconductor are invariably the result of frustrated kinetic energy; and if the mechanism is to be purely electronic (as it surely is in the cuprates) it must be frustrated electronic kinetic energy. In a true Landau (quasiparticle) Fermi liquid, the Fermi surface is by definition determined in such a way as to minimize the electronic kinetic energy as renormalized by interactions: there is no frustrated kinetic energy. Thus there can be no attractive interactions for opposite spins. Superexchange as in the $t - J$ model, as well as interlayer tunneling interactions, requires frustration: the elementary excitations must not be true quasiparticles, but projected entities of different algebraic and possibly topological character. We may make a small table of possible attractive interactions:

	Intralayer	Interlayer
Exchange	Superexchange	IL Superexchange (Millis-Monien)
Josephson	Pair Hopping ?? (charge stiffness)	IL Pair Hopping (PWA-Hsu-Wheatley)

Note that pair hopping within the plane (coherent charge motion) is not frustrated in the NFL state, only in the RVB state: hence we can apparently get superconductivity in one layer if we go first into the RVB state. But any 2D NFL frustrates interlayer hopping, hence the IL mechanisms work from the NFL state.

One final remark needs to be made. The antiferromagnetic insulator gains extra energy from umklapp processes, hence is a downward cusp in energy *vs* x at $x = 0$. (As can be seen by the indeterminacy of $\mu = (\frac{dE}{dx})^{-1}$). The metallic state has screening of the long-range Coulomb interaction, which means that low density x has negative curvature $\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial x^2} < 0$. Hence small x is not a stable homogeneous thermodynamic state. On some, presumably microscopic but occasionally macroscopic, scale it will phase separate. Yoshimori's XPS measurements clearly illustrate that this is happening in $(LaSr)_2CuO_4$. This phase separation which causes "stripes" is however clearly over by the optimally doped concentration in every case. Hence it is an interesting phenomenon, but somewhat irrelevant to our major concerns. It seems likely to inhibit superconductivity by trapping the charge fluctuations, except insofar as one obtains quasimacroscopic superconducting droplets of near optimal concentration.

It is not possible for me to acknowledge all the colleagues with whom I have had useful discussions during the past 12 years. A list must include M. Norman, S. Chakravarty, G. Baskaran, S. Strong, S. Kivelson, A. Adbo, W. Puttিকা, R. Laughlin, T. Hsu, T.M. Rice, N.-P. Ong, but also many others. I also most acknowledge the Aspen Center for Physics.

-
- [1] P.W. Anderson, *Science*, **235**, 1196 (1987)
 - [2] P.W. Anderson. Proceedings of the Enrico Fermi International School of Physics, Varenna, Italy, July 1987, *Frontiers and Borderlines in Many Particle Physics*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam 1987)
 - [3] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou, PhW. Anderson, *Sol. St. Comm.* **63**, 973 (1987)
 - [4] X.-G. Wen and P.A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **76**, 503 (1996); N. Nagaosa and P.A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **79**, 3577 (1997); P.A. Lee, and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 2193 (1998)
 - [5] V. Kalmeyer and R.B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **59**, 2095 (1987); I. Affleck and J.B. Marston, *Phys. Rev.* **37**, 3664 (1988)
 - [6] F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev.*, **B 39**, 11413 (1989)
 - [7] P.W. Anderson, *The Theory of Superconductivity in the High T_c Cuprates* Princeton University Press, Princeton (1997)
 - [8] I. Affleck, Z. Zou, T. Hsu and P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **B38**, 745 (1988); G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev.* **B37**, 3664 (1998); see also F.C. Zhang, C. Gros, T.M. Rice and H. Shiba, *Supercond. Sci., Tech.*, **1**, 36 (1988). For a good review of much of the material, see T.M. Rice, in *Strongly-Interacting Fermions and High- T_c Superconductivity*, (Les Houches Summer School 1991), B. Doucot and J. Zinn-Justin, eds., p. 19, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.
 - [9] W.O. Puttিকা, M.U. Luchini, R. Singh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **81**, 2966 (1998); D. Scalapino and S. White, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 1271; *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **81**, 3222 (1998)
 - [10] F.D.M. Haldane, "Luttinger's Theorem and Bosonization of the Fermi Surface", In *Perspectives in Many-Particle Physics*, eds. R. Broglia and J.R. Schrieffer. (North Holland, Amsterdam 1994, pp. 5-30)

- [11] P.W. Anderson, in SNS 1997, A. Bansil, Y. Fujii, R.N. Shelton etc., J. Phys. Chem. Solids, **59**, 1675 (1998)
- [12] A Phase Diagram like Fig. 1 is implicit in Refs. 1–2 but is clearly set out in V.J. Emery and S. Kivelson, Nature **374** 434 (1995)